

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 14, which are independent, are amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification.

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. OBJECTIONS

Claims 1 and 14 were objected to.

Claims 1 and 14 are amended, thereby obviating the objections.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-8 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,614,804 to McFadden et al. (hereinafter, merely "McFadden") and in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,884,150 to Kanda (hereinafter, merely "Kanda").

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,754,719 to Nakatsugawa et al. (hereinafter, merely “Nakatsugawa”) and in view of Kanda.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over McFadden and in view of Kanda and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,345,185 to Yoon et al. (hereinafter, merely “Yoon”).

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over McFadden and in view of Kanda and further in view of Nakatsugawa.

Claims 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over McFadden and Kanda and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,434,432 to Hao et al. (hereinafter, merely “Hao”).

IV. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

wherein the information signal includes image signals, and at least one functional block of the plural functional blocks performs an image quality improvement processing, and the common command includes information related to the image quality improvement processing. (emphasis added)

The Office Action (see pages 3 and 9) concedes that McFadden and Nakatsugawa fail to disclose or render predictable the above-identified features of claim 1 and relies on item “a” in Figure 4 and column 5, line 30-column 6, line 61 of Kanda to reject “**wherein the information signal includes image signals, and at least one functional block of the plural functional blocks performs an image quality improvement processing, and the common command includes information related to the image quality improvement processing,**” as

recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants submit that the Office Action errors in at least the following two aspects.

1. Kanda Are not Combinable with Either McFadden Or Nakatsugawa.

The Office Action (see page 3) states that Kanda and McFadden are Combinable because:

a. Both Kanda and McFadden are in the same field of “image transfer between multiple devices.”

b. The motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art was to provide “an inexpensive information reproducer capable of reproducing a still picture of good quality.”

Applicants submit that McFadden “concerns the use of existing satellite communications for downloading data to entertainment devices connected to a user’s television.” (see column 1, lines 5-15 of McFadden) The disclosure of McFadden describes how to transfer data, such as image data and software data, in a network formed by televisions and satellites. In contrast, Kanda “relates to an apparatus for reproducing video information recorded on a recording medium such as a recording disk.” (see column 1, lines 5-8 of Kanda). The disclosure in Kanda describes how to reproduce still image from a recording disk. The still image of Kanda is read from a recording disk and processed by a reproducer.

The characterization of McFadden and Kanda in the Office Action is substantially broader than it should be. The field of “image transfer between multiple devices”, as stated in the Office Action, covers fields with radically different technologies, such as wire transmission and wireless transmission of image data or transmission of encoded and non-encoded image data.

Many more similar examples could be listed here to assert that the characterization in the Office Action is incorrect. Applicants submit that Kanda merely read out image from a disk and does not transfer images among devices using satellite that is the field of McFadden. Therefore, McFadden and Kanda are not in the same field of endeavor.

The reason to combine McFadden and Kanda given in the Office Action, “for the purpose of providing an inexpensive information reproducer capable of reproducing a still picture of good quality,” is unobvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art. On the contrary, McFadden and Kanda, if their elements are mechanically added, would produce a more expensive device than either McFadden or Kanda for at least the additional functions and elements added to each other.

To combine Kanda and Nakatsugawa, the Office Action (see page 9) applies the same reasons as those of Kanda and McFadden. However, Nakatsugawa relates to communications among functional appliances. Nothing in the disclosure of Nakatsugawa suggests that image data are transferred during the communication. Therefore, Nakasugawa is not in the same field as that of Kanda or McFadden. Furthermore, Applicants submit that the Office Action needs to state a separate set of reasons to combine Kanda and Nakatsugawa.

2. Kanda Does not Disclose or Render Predictable the Above-Identified Features of Claim 1.

Applicants submit that item “a” in Kanda is actually a switching signal that controls the switch 20, 23, and 25 in Figure 4 of Kanda, the same of which is also asserted in the Office Action, which states that “the command “a” enables the quality improvement processing

to be output to D/A converter 14.” (see Office Action, page 3). Applicants submit that it is incorrect to interpret a switch signal as “**information related to the image quality improvement processing**,” as recited in claim 1. The item “a” of Kanda merely changes the position of the above-identified switches and is not related to image quality improvement processing.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable.

Claims 14 and 15, which recite similar limitations with claim 1, are also patentable for similar reasons.

As nothing in the prior art cited in the Office Action cures the above-identified deficiencies, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

VI. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. As nothing in the prior art cited in the Office Action cures the above-identified deficiencies, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections. As each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


Because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 

Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800